

3.0 RESPONSES TO REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION TRANSCRIPT OF NOVEMBER 10, 2010

Lynne Plambeck – Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment

Comment 1

This comment consists of a request for a 120-day extension to the public review and comment period for the Draft EIR.

Response 1

Los Angeles County appreciates your comments and they will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis presented in the Draft EIR and no further response is required. The public comment period for the Draft EIR was originally from September 28, 2010 to November 11, 2010 for a comment period of 45 days. On November 10, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission extended the Draft EIR public comment period to January 4, 2011, for a public review period of 99 days.

Comment 2

The commenter stated that Mission Village project should not be considered until the applicant has received its permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) relating to the Newhall Ranch Resource Management Development Plan and San Fernando Valley spineflower Conservation Plan (RMDP/SCP).

Response 2

With respect to the comment regarding the need to wait for the conclusion of the Army Corps of Engineer's permit process for the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP EIS/EIR, the County's review of the Mission Village project and EIR need not await the outcome of the USACE permitting process or completion of the EIS/EIR prepared by USACE and the CDFG. Please see Topical Response 2: Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP Project and Associated EIS/EIR regarding the relationship between the Mission Village EIR and the USACE and CDFG permitting processes, and associated Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP EIS/EIR.

Comment 3

The comment indicates that there is no immediate need for the project. There are already 40,000 approved dwelling units and graded lots in the Santa Clarita Valley, so there is no need to rush the review of the Mission Village project.

Response 3

Because the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis presented in the Draft EIR, no further response can be provided or is required. The comment will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

Comment 4

The comment is a statement asking for a longer review and comment period because of the numerous environment documents and thousands of pages the commenter must review.

Response 4

Because the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis presented in the Draft EIR, no further response can be provided or is required. The comment will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. Please see Response 1 above regarding the request for additional review time.

Comment 5

The comment indicates that the County should review the mitigation monitoring plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan to make sure that all mitigation measures are being completed.

Response 5

Because the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis presented in the Draft EIR, no further response can be provided or is required. The comment will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

Comment 6

The comment states that because the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) will not be constructed in the first phase of development on Newhall Ranch, and wastewater will go to the Valencia WRP, the Draft EIR must analyze the project's impact relative to chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

Response 6

The issue of wastewater treatment and disposal is addressed in the Draft EIR in Section 4.9, Wastewater Disposal. For responses to the issue raised in this comment, please see responses to the commenter's

other letters submitted on the Draft EIR (**Letter C14** dated January 2, 2011, **Responses 29** through **32**, and **Letter C22** dated March 16, 2011, **Responses 1** through **11**). For additional related information, please see **Topical Response 5: Chloride** and **Topical Response 6: Water Quality**.

Comment 7

The comment indicates that because the applicant is no longer the company it was before the bankruptcy, past performance cannot be used as an indication of the quality of development that will occur with the proposed project.

Response 7

Because the comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the analysis presented in the Draft EIR, no further response can be provided or is required. The comment will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. Please also see **Topical Response No. 2: Bankruptcy-Related Comments** for additional information responsive to this comment.